

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for participating in interviews on June 20, 27 and July 16, 2007. The present claims, proposed amendments thereof, and the prior art of record were discussed. It was agreed that the claim 1 as amended above is not anticipated or rendered unpatentable by any prior art of record. Particularly, the Examiner suggested the phrase "information that is obtained through inference, but not directly extracted from prespecified fields, explicitly defined attributes or tagged elements of an information content" that Applicants have now inserted into all pending independent claims instead of the previous language that mentioned an implicit data source. Favorable consideration of the claims as amended is requested.

In response to the office action dated April 2, 2007, Applicants are amending claims 1, 13, 14, 26, 27, 39, 40, 51, 52, 63, 64 and 75, including each of the independent claims 1, 14, 27, 40, 52 and 64. Claims 76-111 have been withdrawn. As such, claims 1-20, 22-33, 35-46, 48-58, 60-70 and 72-75 as amended are pending.

The independent claims 1, 14, 27, 40, 52 and 64 are being amended to replace the language regarding an implicit data source with the phrase "information that is obtained through inference, but not directly extracted from prespecified fields, explicitly defined attributes or tagged elements of an information content" as suggested by the Examiner. The amendment is supported throughout the present disclosure, for example in the description of data sources 36 shown in Figure 2, where examples are given and it is also stated that "Implicit member information may be defined as information that infers, but does not directly state, interest, expertise or responsibility of an individual regarding a certain subject." Spec. 0048-0055. Corresponding amendments are made in some dependent claims.

No new matter is added.

Rejection under section 112

Claims 1-20, 22-33, 35-46, 48-58, 60-70 and 72-75 were rejected under § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement, due to the

previous amendment regarding an implicit data source. The rejection referred back to the Examiner's statements in paragraph 3 of the office action. Office action page 3. Applicants submit that the rejection is moot in view of the present amendment, which removes the claim language at issue. However, Applicants are not conceding that the rejection has merit, and particularly do not agree that the Examiner's positions taken in paragraph 3 of the office action have support in the record or otherwise.

Rejection under section 102

Claims 1-20, 22-33, 35-46, 48-58, 60-70 and 72-75 were rejected under § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. 6,480,885 (Olivier). This rejection is moot in view of the above amendments. Moreover, it was agreed in the interview that the claim 1 as amended above is not anticipated or rendered unpatentable by any prior art of record. This amendment is also made in the other independent claims 14, 27, 40, 52 and 64. As such, Applicants submit that each of the rejected claims is not anticipated or rendered unpatentable by Olivier.

Conclusion

Favorable consideration of the pending claims as amended is requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Ostertag et al.
Serial No. : 10/620,539
Filed : July 16, 2003
Page : 23 of 23

Attorney's Docket No.: 13905-042001 / 2003P00093
US

Please apply \$120 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

7/23/07



J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696